HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 28 Saturday, July 9, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Along Diplomatic Row: Today, as those who plan to attend the Geneva get-together take plane or ship at New York, the general opinion among the press is that nothing much will happen or be accomplished at the "summit" conference. That, indeed, is one of the tunes that the Administration propaganda plays — naturally, to prevent too rosy hopes which eventually might prove to be disappointing. But certain other observers in the press aren't so sure that nothing will be the outcome. They note that one U.S. diplomat present will be Ambassador (to Russia) "Chip" Bohlen. He was one of the architects of the disastrous Yalta meeting and, they say, a very willing one, at that. Furthermore, the skeptical watchers on diplomatic row evince concern about one gap in the U.S. delegation, as follows:

Walter Robertson, head of the Far Eastern division of the State Department, is not scheduled to join the U.S. group. Robertson has been pro-Chiang, deeply doubtful of Moscow and Red China intentions. What's this? — ask veterans in the embassies. Will Bohlen sell out Formosa, while Robertson is absent? Capitol Hill opponents of appeasement have set up a protest to this kind of shenanigan, may force Dulles to take Robertson at the last minute.

● "Swagger and soap" is the term used to describe Moscow's policy on the eve of the "summit" meeting to open on July 18th in Geneva, Switzerland. Foreign experts develop little excitement over Khrushchev's sudden appearance, with Bulganin, at the American Embassy July 4th celebration. They link it with the more recent "fly-by" of new planes of the Russian air force — the swaggering threat. They recall that Adolph Hitler followed the same course, showing movies of the might of the Wehrmacht and of the Luftwaffe one day, holding big "friendly" receptions the next.

● On Capitol Hill, various members of Congress are disturbed by the following report coming from within the State Department:

Some of the old Acheson crowd in the Department have started talk of the necessity for sending food to Red China, where famine and starvation reign. The talk is very private so far, but it fits in with the thinking of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, who reportedly wants an appeasement policy. The influence which Dr. Eisenhower exerts on his brother, the President, was underlined this week when Roscoe Drummond, "liberal" columnist (*Washington Post*, July 6), quoted the President on the subject of Milton, as saying: "I think I would rather take Milton's views than those of anyone else."

● Among those members of Congress who keep abreast of expert opinion on our foreign policy, many are showing doubts, now, about the Austrian treaty. Far from being an highly encouraging sign of Russian conciliation, as Dulles claimed, it looks like Moscow "put one over" not only on the Austrians but on the United States. Foreigners, constantly in touch with sources in Central Europe, say that the treaty welds little Austria even more closely to the economic might of the Soviet Union than previously realized, without any perceptible advantage to the lesser partner to the deal. Furthermore, extravagant hopes built on the treaty tend to make hitherto coolheaded Austrians warm up to Russia and forget the Soviet duplicity of the recent past.

Democrats in Trouble: The Democrats received a severe blow in the past week, with the disabling of Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas, Majority Leader of the upper house. The Johnson boom for Democratic presidential nomination (see HUMAN EVENTS, June 18) had been growing fast, but now is completely deflated. Even if Johnson recovers from his cardiac attack sufficiently to resume duties as Majority Leader by the first of the year, it is agreed that he will not be able to run for nomination. No party puts up a candidate with a record of heart trouble.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Next, Eisenhower has given the Democrats a licking in the Dixon-Yates affair. Democratic demagoguery about the "great sinister power trust" makes little impression on the public — who, it is suspected, now sees the issue of Federal-owned power as one of a raid on the Treasury and therefore on the taxpayer. When the Dixon-Yates legislation came up for a test vote this week, the Democratic demagogues could not even hold a number of Democratic members of Congress in line.

Financial: Members of Congress, like everyone else, are chattering about the big trade-in allowances on autos — how they can get 50% more this year than last, etc. But those who have a pipe-line to the auto industry serve a warning. They remind others that these big allowances result from the bigger discounts allowed dealers by the manufacturers and from the sharp competition for sales. While the Big Three motor companies are racking up big earnings now, this sharp competitive situation will eventually take its toll. Hence, the wise ones warn that 1955 fourth-quarter earnings of the Big Three may well show a sharp drop.

Dead Dupes: Many in the press stress the present "deadness" of McCarthy, alleging that he has lost "news value." But there is another school among observers here who say that, if Joe is a "dead duck" (and they deny that he is), how about the "dead dupes?" They refer to Senators Watkins and Flanders, who, a year ago, enjoyed headlines in the press.

Many observers always contended these two Republican Senators were dupes of the "liberal" newspapermen and radio commentators, that the latter — in order to split the GOP — gave these normally obscure Senators from the grass-roots unprecedented praise and unusual spotlight value. Both legislators, obviously pleased with such notice, basked in their brief appearance on the front of the stage. Today, any newsman on Capitol Hill — who recalls the uproar of mid-1954 — now notes that Flanders and Watkins have retreated to obscurity, that their quondam friends on the Left rarely mention them in news copy; and colleagues of the two in the Republican cloakroom marvel at the present forlorn-ness of two men who just twelve months ago strutted their little hour before the Kleig lights.

Kohler Strike: After forcing Ford to knuckle under, with the rest of the automobile industry to follow, Reuther has returned to the one strike he lost — against Kohler of Kohler. Teams of UAW speakers are appearing before construction trades union locals — membership 1,500,000 — all over the United States urging a boycott of Kohler products. Plumbing unions receive special attention. However, despite the concentrated effort, Kohler is now producing at normal. For every order lost by the boycott drive, so run the reports, at least one has been gained from people specifically demanding Kohler products.

The strike was called in spite of the fact that Kohler's wage — weekly average $87.45 — was substantially higher than any manufacturing wages with which comparisons could be made. The plumbing industry's average was $76.04; the average for Sheboygan (3 miles from Kohler) was $65.52, and for Milwaukee County (60 miles away), was $80.49. So far, 460 acts of violence against company property and against nonstrikers have been reported.

Progressive Education: Newspapers on June 26 ran the announcement (of the day before) that the Progressive Education Association had decided to dissolve and go out of business. In the midst of the country-wide agitation over "Can Johnny Read?," a series of articles by Dr. Rudolph Flesch, critic of progressive education, the demise of the Association is taken, by students of education, to be a sign of the times.

The Progressive Education Association was organized in 1919 and announced that progressive teaching methods, when they became universal, would quickly and sharply reduce the amount of juvenile delinquency; and, when the "progressively" educated children grew up, the amount of adult crimes would be similarly diminished.

The PEA people hastened to add that the complete elimination of crime would be a different matter because there was another major cause of crime — namely, poverty. "Liberals" then said poverty was the natural consequence of capitalism; and curing poverty, they continued, depended upon the willingness of educators to use their positions and influence boldly to conduct a crusade for economic revolution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American schools have now had the experience of over three decades of progressive education. It is observed that today there is little poverty and the U.S. has never enjoyed so much material well-being as at present. Yet delinquency — it is noted — has never climbed to so high a level. Additionally, parents all over the country are deeply concerned about the lack of real instruction given to children under progressive education in the public schools.

Benjamin Fine, *New York Times* education editor, commenting on the announcement of the dissolution of the Progressive Education Association, said the principal reason for its disappearance was "the disrepute, even contempt, in which the term 'progressive' has been held in recent years. In many school systems, it has been the educational 'kiss of death' to be labelled a disciple of Dewey or a member of the Progressive Education Association." Fine perhaps exaggerates. But there has been progress in the crusade against progressive education, in the last ten years. HUMAN EVENTS has taken a leading role in this drive, despite bitter denunciation by "liberals."

Yet, observers here agree, the progressive education forces have only executed a strategic retreat. The meeting of the NEA this week in Chicago indicates that the followers of Dewey are now concentrating their drive on Federal Aid to Education, doubtless calculating that if they can put over their ideas at the top — in Washington — their over-all influence will prove more successful.

Silver Subsidy: Hearings are to start very soon in the Senate on S. 1427, a bill jointly sponsored by Senator Paul Douglas and six Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut Senators to repeal the silver subsidy. Silverware manufacturers are concentrated largely in New England. The silver purchase program began in 1933 by FDR's proclamation. Next came the 1934 Act which re-expressed national monetary aims to give a permanent niche to silver, not through bi-metallism but by building up silver reserves along with gold. Huge silver buying ensued. The domestic mines' silver subsidy, based on Presidential proclamation, was made statutory in 1939. Almost continuously since 1933 domestic silver has enjoyed a Treasury subsidy.

What makes this year's hearings interesting is the shift in the Eisenhower Administration's position. In 1953, Messrs. Humphrey and Burgess took the nation's monetary helm, uttering their motto, "sound money." But in 1954 when silver users' Senators sought Administration encouragement for repeal, they got the opposite. Silver buying by the Treasury is inflationary in direction; it hardly can be called "sound money." Yet in 1954, the Treasury killed the repeal effort, when it said: "Such legislation under today's special conditions would not be timely."

However, this year the Treasury writes that it "would not be disposed to object to the enactment" of repeal legislation. "Sound money" advocates remark that, with the economy booming, there has never been a better time for repeal.

New Conservatism: Infiltration of the conservatives is the new development on the campus and in the academic world. At any rate, it happened at Harvard, as in the case of so many other developments deriving from the Left. The Conservative League in Cambridge, dedicated to individualism, anti-Communism and traditional Americanism (of which David Cole is Secretary, see HUMAN EVENTS, November 3, 1954) is embattled with what seems to be a new "splinter group" called the Conservative Club (see *Harvard Crimson*, June 16) which is said to be more "liberal" than conservative. A clear division between the groups appeared at the time of the recent debate in Cambridge, between Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Professor Russell Kirk, which drew this pithy comment from one conservative: "I came here to hear a debate between a conservative and liberal, and all I got was an argument between a conservative liberal and a liberal liberal."

Now comes more extensive examination of the infiltration in an article in the *Freeman* (July) entitled "Collectivism Rebaptized," by Dr. Frank S. Meyer. Kirk has been under fire for some time from the pens of such writers as William F. Buckley, Jr., Suzanne LaFollette and John Chamberlain. Dr. Meyer extends and deepens the barrage, on the intellectual plane; he classifies Kirk with Claude Rossiter, author of *Conservatism in America*. Rossiter's appeal, Meyer says, "presents nothing in its essential principles and program with which Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., or Adlai Stevenson would seriously disagree." Meyer notes the affectionate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hospitality of the "liberals" towards the Kirks and Rossiters. "They (the 'liberals') realize that the New Conservatives, with their emphasis on tone and mood, with their lack of clear principle and their virulent rejection of individualism and a free economy, threaten no dangers to the pillars of the temple. The conservative tone is indeed welcome now that power is to so large an extent achieved and the time come to consolidate and 'conserve' it. Even better, by the magnanimity with which they receive the New Conservatives into polite society, they justify expelling into outer darkness the principal champions of limited government and a free economy as 'crackpots' and 'fringe elements.'

"They know their enemies. Their judgment is good. Only the principles of individual freedom — to Dr. Kirk the 'conservatism of desolation' — can call a halt to the march of collectivism. The New Conservatism, stripped of its pretensions, is, sad to say, but another guise for the collectivist spirit of the age."

The Meyer piece is more than an intellectual dissection. In view of Kirk's recent rise to fame, it may prove to be a major political event with many repercussions on the thinking of those Right of Center.

Correction: General Bonner Fellers and HUMAN EVENTS hasten to explain a statement in the General's recent piece, "The Red Fly-By Over Moscow," June 25th issue: "It [Military Intelligence] has consistently underestimated enemy air strengths. The World War II Luftwaffe strength surprised us." Space limitations precluded his paying tribute to the remarkable job which our Berlin military attaches did in warning Washington of the growing strength of the Luftwaffe before World War II.

Colonel Truman Smith, of G-2, Military Attache in Berlin in those years, got the collaboration of Colonel Charles Lindbergh in observing German aircraft production and reported his findings in great detail to Military Intelligence — one of the great G-2 feats of recent times.

The story of how Smith did this is one of the little-known but important episodes of the last twenty-five years. As Chief of the U.S. military attaches in Berlin, 1935-39, the Colonel was getting some good info on German Air Force build-up, from his military aides. But he knew the Germans weren't letting the Americans see all that was going on. One day, in the newspaper, he noted that Charles Lindbergh was visiting in London. He had an inspiration, wrote to Lindbergh, got him to come to Berlin. At the same time, Smith offered to introduce Lindbergh to Marshal Goering, head of the German air effort. He knew the Germans would want to exploit Lindbergh for publicity purposes. They swallowed the bait, and Lindbergh — primed by Smith — got Goering to open up to him various secret factories. Every evening Lindbergh would huddle with Smith and his staff, draft cables of the secret picture of the growing Luftwaffe for the information of the War Department in Washington.

General Fellers comments: "But despite these compelling and alarming reports to Washington — our Military Intelligence people on the national level failed utterly to impress our top leaders so that this vital information could be translated into defense measures. The result was that we entered World War II with a P-40 fighter which was inferior to the Japanese Zero and the German ME-109 fighter."

The fact is that the White House was warned about the Luftwaffe threat but would not heed the warnings. Hence the American public — but not G-2 — was surprised when, in 1939-40, the Luftwaffe unbared its tremendous strength.

Letter from A. C. WEDEMEYER, General, U. S. Army (Retd.): "In my judgment HUMAN EVENTS is one of the most valuable publications in America today. It presents factual information and constructive evaluations concerning national and international developments. I have been a subscriber for many years and strongly recommend it to my fellow Americans."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. *Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.* By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. **Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 28 HUMAN EVENTS July 9, 1955

Article Section

THE MURROW MYTH

The Truth About The $150,000-a-Year CBS Commentator

By VICTOR LASKY

WILL WONDERS NEVER CEASE? So rarely do "liberals" admit anything which might create havoc with anti-anti-Communist mythology that, with a low bow, it must be recorded that the publisher of the *New York Post,* Dorothy Schiff, has just criticized Edward R. Murrow as "biased."

Since Murrow is one of eggheadery's outstanding heroes, having had the "courage" to demolish Joe McCarthy with craftily-edited film, the fact he was criticized by Dorothy Schiff is news, indeed.

Big news, too, considering Mrs. Schiff, in the process, also belted another of eggheadery's sterling characters, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Mrs. Schiff, whose apparently unedited copy appears weekly in the *Post,* referred June 19 to Alcoa's recent decision to cancel sponsorship of Murrow's "See It Now" TV show.

Ordinarily, the event would have aroused passionate denunciations of Alcoa for capitulating to the "know-nothings," the *Post's* favorite term for anti-Communists.

Instead, Mrs. Schiff pointed out that Alcoa had continued sponsorship for a year after Murrow's telecast on McCarthy, about which apparently she has no qualms. The "proverbial straw," she wrote, may have been the "sympathetic interview conducted by Murrow . . . which seemed biased in favor of Oppenheimer."

By all ADA rules, Murrow had no choice but to be "sympathetic" with Oppenheimer, objectivity notwithstanding. To respectable conformists, lack of objectivity is sin only when indulged in, say, by a Fulton Lewis or a George Sokolsky. It's perfectly proper in the case of an Elmer Davis or an Ed Murrow.

For example, the *Herald Tribune's* TV critic, John Crosby, has frequently assailed Fulton Lewis as a "biased" observer. Yet, last year, he actually praised the fact that Murrow, in committing mayhem on McCarthy, "did it without even a pretense of impartiality."

MRS. SCHIFF, whose newspaper — according to some unkind wits — never could be accused of ever reporting a fact straight, nevertheless, was troubled by Murrow's Oppenheimer telecast. It "worried" her, she reported, "because the Oppenheimer case does not seem to me and other liberals such as former Senator Benton and Secretary for Air Finletter, a clear-cut issue on which liberals can make a fight."

Mrs. Schiff, thus, conceded the government might have acted wisely in suspending the physicist's "Q" clearance. And, lest she stand alone in her heresy to "liberal" conformity, she pointed out two other ADA-approved celebrities were in agreement. (Mrs. Schiff's occasional disclosures of sentiments privately expressed, though usually disapproved by the persons quoted, often are refreshing, indeed.)

"Murrow," she said, "asked Oppenheimer only questions that tended to put him in the best possible light. The impression left with the uninformed viewer was that of a hero and a martyr. Murrow did not ask anything which would have raised doubt concerning the character of his protagonist. Why, for instance, was Oppenheimer in favor of research on the H-bomb in 1944 but opposed in 1949? Was not the moral issue the same?"

Many a *Post* reader, inured to a steady diet of hair-raising tales of villainous "McCarthyite" activities, by now must have swallowed their Stevenson buttons in amazement. For Mrs. Schiff went on to criticize the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic for distributing film versions of the interview.

"I deplore this," she wrote, "because those who see it will not have read the huge amount of material in the case. They will leave reinforced in what many of them would prefer to believe — that a great man has been grievously wronged."

If, say, an American Legion Post had protested the Ford's film in this manner, the *Post* undoubtedly would have cried, "censorship."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT IS ONE of those ironies that through the years Edward R. Murrow's "objectivity" has been highly touted. A gushing *New Yorker* profile actually reported in late 1953 that "among the public men who have commended Murrow for his fairness is Senator Joseph McCarthy."

An admiring associate was quoted as asserting that Murrow is "too much of a fanatic about being a reporter to throw in a lot of opinions when he thinks the facts will make the point by themselves."

And there, in a nutshell, is the Murrow technique — the painstaking selection of facts which "will make the point" he wants made. Murrow is a master at this technique, having employed it for years on radio. On TV, he has perfected the technique of editing film in a manner shrewdly calculated to illustrate any point he wants made. Yet, as he sits back, puffing a cigaret, he is able to appear the acme of objectivity.

For example, in his TV coverage of a dispute between Indiana's American Legion and the American Civil Liberties Union, the Legionnaires were made to look like a collection of Fascist-minded crackpots, while the civil libertarians appeared like decent small-town folk. As John Crosby summed up the total effect: "Mr. Murrow showed the two meetings — the Legion's and the Civil Liberties Union — jumping back and forth from the regimented atmosphere of the Legion's to the democratic reasonableness of the Union's . . . . Murrow simply presented the facts (and the faces) and let them speak for themselves."

Murrow's selection of faces is typical of his technique. Writing of another "liberal"-"conservative" imbroglio, telecast by Murrow, the *New York World-Telegram and Sun's* Harriet Van Horne commented on a New Jersey right-wing women's group as consisting of "American Gothic types, grim as granite." Apparently, Murrow's "liberal" gals would put Marilyn Monroe to shame.

MURROW'S UNFAIR USE of film never was more vividly demonstrated than in his telecast which made McCarthy look like a giggling psychopath. Even the Senator's most vehement critics will admit he's anything but. The *New Yorker's* Dick Rovere, for example, called him "a political figure of the first rank . . . quite possibly an authentic genius."

For the most part, "liberals" applauded the hatchet-job. But there were a few significant exceptions. The *Saturday Review's* Gilbert Seldes, for example, as much as he despised McCarthy, nevertheless, was troubled.

"The people who roared with delight," he wrote, "should ask themselves quickly how they would have felt if the same technique had been applied to someone they liked — for example, to the Stevenson whom McCarthy so coyly called 'Alger — I mean Adlai.' "

McCarthy, of course, made his "coy" observation as a political partisan during a campaign. Whatever his merits, McCarthy never claimed to be "impartial."

Murrow, however, claims to be an "impartial" commentator who, working in a new medium, supposedly aimed at presenting all sides of an issue.

The fact is, as the anti-McCarthy *Commonweal's* John Cogley pointed out, certain other commentators, through a different selection of film, easily could have shown McCarthy to be "a man on a shining white steed — infinitely reasonable (and) wholly without self interest. . . . I believe film footage could be found to suggest these noble attributes."

Cogley pointed out that the "Murrow show has set a potentially dangerous precedent which those who are now applauding it may find good reason to regret in time to come."

THE WONDER IS that Murrow has been able to get away with it, despite such recent criticism. He still is able to present one-sided bias as objective radio-TV coverage. A few months ago, for example, when Senator Knowland suggested a blockade of Red China as a method for freeing imprisoned U.S. flyers, Murrow recorded a Stanford University lecture by Professor Thomas Bailey.

Bailey told his students that blockades, at best, would be futile, and, at worst, they could lead to war. Murrow's only editorial comment was that Bailey was not famous. "But after all," he added, "knowledge and judgment are not necessarily linked to fame."

The *New York Post's* Jay Nelson Tuck gushed over this latest exhibition of "courage."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Murrow, the TV critic contended, "had cut [Knowland] into small, gory splinters." The fact Murrow did not present Knowland's side of the argument appeared unimportant.

This telecast demonstrated still another facet of the Murrow technique — that of letting others, like Professor Bailey, do his fighting for him. Murrow even will dip into the classics or cite such as Lincoln, Diogenes, Twain or Holmes on contemporary affairs about which none of them could possibly have been expected to have had advance judgments. Quoting the ancients permits Murrow to make his points without appearing to be giving his own opinions.

At times, Murrow will quote the living, as when he read some *New Yorker* verse by E. B. White, attacking loyalty investigations. Or when he recalled President Eisenhower's urging to Dartmouth students "not to give in to the book-burners."

Once Murrow concluded a broadcast, thusly: "Bertold Brecht, German poet — and an exile himself — put it this way: 'A man can be free even within prison walls. Freedom is something spiritual. And whoever once had it, can never lose it. For while the body can be bound with chains, the spirit can never!' "

Few listeners probably knew that Brecht is Soviet Germany's leading "cultural light." Needless to say, quoting a Commie on "freedom" is absurd.

Murrow occasionally will voice opinions directly. As when he pooh-poohed Attorney General Brownell's charges against the late Harry Dexter White, insisting the "practice" of accusing a dead man of espionage "without producing evidence" could well "be applied to you or to me." In effect, he accused Eisenhower of condoning "false accusations." (Curiously, Ike later was to defend Murrow as a "friend," when McCarthy struck back at the commentator.)

MURROW LONG HAS BEEN in the forefront of those opposed to "harsh" security measures. He has defended Alger Hiss, John Stewart Service, John Paton Davies and Owen Lattimore. The latter acknowledged Murrow's assistance in June, 1950, when he published "Ordeal by Slander."

"Before I could speak for myself," wrote Lattimore, Murrow "kept the record straight by repeatedly drawing attention to the fact that nothing had been proved against me. Later, by . . . using recordings, he gave me a national forum of my own, so that millions of people could hear me speaking for myself, in excerpts from my testimony."

In private life, Murrow has gone to bat for others suspected, with cause, of leftwing sympathies. He testified in behalf of Joe Julian, a radio writer who had brought a libel suit against "Red Channels" for listing him among "pro-Communist" show folk. (The suit eventually was dismissed.)

Although Murrow has persistently berated anti-Communists in government, including Vice President Nixon and the State Department's Scott McLeod, he has yet to devote a single telecast to the evils of Communism. He constantly underrates the Red menace, both internationally and at home.

Long before Ike decided to go to the Summit, Murrow was urging negotiations with the Kremlin, claiming in 1953 "new tides" were running in Moscow following Stalin's demise. He was particularly critical of the State Department's refusal to accede to Winston Churchill's proposal for a meeting with Malenkov. Murrow said American "hatred and hysteria" should not be permitted to prevent the Big Three meeting.

Although, Murrow as yet has refrained from declaring for recognition of the Peiping regime, he has done everything but.

Last February, when debate was raging on the Formosa issue, Murrow interviewed Prime Minister Nehru for "See It Now." Nehru, who is a "great statesman" in Murrow's book, urged a sell-out of Chiang Kai-shek, as was to be expected. Murrow, as usual, avoided asking any embarrassing questions of Nehru.

Prior to that, Murrow leaped on West Point and Annapolis for refusing to permit cadets and midshipmen to debate the question of recognizing Peiping. Senator A. Willis Robertson, a Democrat, told the Senate he "regretted" Murrow's attitude.

The Virginian pointed out it was U.S. policy to oppose UN admission of Peiping. Since every boy who enters a service school is subject to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military regulations, he added, "they have no more right to publicly challenge the foreign policy of the Commander-In-Chief than do the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"Mr. Murrow's word for today that it is better to debate a decision before it is reached than to debate the decision afterward is a good theory when properly applied," Robertson concluded.

NEEDLESS TO SAY, the *Daily Worker* frequently praises Murrow. This, of course, does not make him a Communist. But the Communist rag does not usually praise anti-Communists. The *Worker,* for example, was particularly exuberant over Murrow's telecast of the case of an Air Force Reserve lieutenant adjudged a security risk. Following the telecast, the Defense Department was flooded with protesting letters. Consequently, Air Force Secretary Talbott reversed the Air Force's earlier decision.

More recently, the *Worker* praised Murrow for his telecast on "book-burning." Murrow had dug up a Los Angeles housewife, Mrs. Anne Smart, who has been circulating a list of books she considered objectionable in school libraries. The list included books by Richard Wright, Carl Sandburg, Mark Van Doren, Bill Mauldin, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Pearl Buck and others.

Admittedly some of the listings are debatable. But it was Mrs. Anne Smart's contention that the unguided distribution of certain books could do damage to the mentally immature and emotionally volatile. This is pretty much what Senator Estes Kefauver, no book-burner he, has been saying in his current pornography probe.

Although Mrs. Smart had her say for a few moments, the net effect of the Murrow telecast was to hold her up to ridicule. Murrow apparently does not realize that, in protesting, Mrs. Smart was exercising her rights as an American. Only in a dictatorship is a private citizen prevented from making such criticism.

Whatever the merits of her argument, Mrs. Smart was willing to stand up and fight for her convictions — unlike the school librarian whom Murrow's cameras showed in silhouette, supposedly frightened lest her identification lead to reprisals.

The telecast inadvertently pointed up some real "book-burning." It seems librarians don't like to read the books. Anyway, the unidentified librarian objected to a new Los Angeles regulation requiring that a book has to be read before it is purchased. The librarian was "shocked" with this, insisting that librarians usually follow "expert" recommendations made by the American Library Association. As reported in HUMAN EVENTS for June 11, 1955, these recommendations usually veer leftwards, while conservative books are discounted.

Murrow's sophisticated summation of the results of the Los Angeles controversy was: "Five banned books have been returned to the shelves; ten are still missing. We can only deduce from this operation that some of our books are missing."

And, a good thing, too, considering that one of the "missing" books is one in which Pearl Buck interviews Mrs. Paul Robeson — an anti-U.S. treatise, naturally.

Murrow, of course, has every right to defend pro-Communist books. He is fully entitled to his left-wing views. He has no right however, to claim to be a disinterested observer. As he himself only recently stated to the *New York Herald Tribune,* "I have never known a completely objective reporter. Each man is to some extent a prisoner of his own experience." And that goes double for Edward R. Murrow!

Victor Lasky, co-author of *Seeds of Treason*, edited *The American Legion Reader.* His last article for HUMAN EVENTS was "Book Burning — How The Librarians Do It" on June 11, 1955.

Additional Copies of the 4-page article; 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 a year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED